

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/733,674	12/08/2000	Akira Tsuboi	1503.64973	2710
24978	7590 01/26/2005		EXAM	INER
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN 300 S WACKER DR			STEELMAN, MARY J	
25TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHICAGO, II	L 60606		2122	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

» * »	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/733,674	TSUBOI, AKIRA				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mary J. Steelman	2122				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the c v r sh t with the c rrespondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 29 November 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the						
issues for appeal; and/or						
<ul><li>(d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:	•					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>5,6,9,11,13,15 and 17</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
	,	M. Huto				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant has argued, in substance the following:

As pointed out on page 3, third paragraph, of Remarks received 11/29/2004, "one of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to combine Sauntry and Crelier" because Sauntry's goal is to decrease the time for execution and decrease the amount of storage space required, whereas Crelier teaches a timestamping process that increases execution time and storage space needed.

Examiner's Response: Both references seek optimal progam development. Examiner agrees that Sauntry's goal is to decrease time for execution and decrease the amount of storage space. Crelier teaches selectively recompiling (col. 2, lies 61-63) modules, thereby reducing the number of recompiles (a decrease in time) by tracking modified files using timestamps. Crelier: col. 3, lines 26-28, "The development system of the present invention includes methodology for improving system performance by decreasing recompilation of dependent source modules." Examiner disagrees. The Crelier invention is meant to improve system performance.

WEI Y. ZHEN

FRIMARY EXAMINER